DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 345 HE 023 540

AUTHOR Roney, Robert K.; And Others
TITLE Graduate Student Concerns: A Study of a College of Education.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 90
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; *College Faculty; Curriculum; Demography; Educational Facilities; *Education Majors; Facilities; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS University of Tennessee Knoxville

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to develop a systematic and accurate process for the assessment of concerns of 408 graduate students in University of Tennessee-Knoxville's College of Education, utilizing a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. A 77-item, Likert-type instrument was developed, with a final open-ended question, covering five categories of interest: administration, faculty, courses/curriculum, facilities, and personal concerns. The most positive ratings were given to the faculty area, with the five top-rated items being advisor's knowledge of field, departmental faculty's knowledge of field, advisor's helpfulness, advisor's instructional ability, and advisor's availability. Students were generally pleased with admissions, registration, and the library. The evaluation of their courses and curriculum were also at the level of acceptable or better. They were not pleased with parking and financial aid. Some of the lowest-rated items were orientation of new students, financial aid publicity, placement services, summer course availability, and secure storage for student materials. Results are analyzed by gender, race, age, graduate assistant status, full-time/part-time status, and department. Six references and a copy of the questionnaire are appended. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319345

GRADUATE STUDENT CONCERNS:

A STUDY OF A COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

ROBERT K. RONEY
FRANCES C. FOWLER
CYNTHIA M. GETTYS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

A PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

APRIL 18, 1990

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH TEAM MEMBERS

FREDERIC W. PATTERSON
JOHN A. REAVES
LINDA D. SMITH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ROBERT K. RONEY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 023 540

GRADUATE STUDENT CONCERNS: A STUDY OF A COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

Objective: The objective of this research was to develop a systematic and accurate process for the assessment of graduate student concerns. The process allowed for student determination of the areas for consideration, as well as their evaluation of those areas. Utilizing a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, the study provided not only an assessment of the present program in the College but may also be the basis for planning improvement in both the College and the various departments.

Perspectives: In recent years graduate students, including those in education, have changed. They have "become increasingly older and more representative of women, minorities, and foreign students" (Schneider, 1984, p. 60). This fact has serious implications for those who plan, administer, and teach in graduate programs. Advanced study is stressful under the best circumstances. However, today's graduate students are likely to experience even greater stress than did their predecessors. For nontraditional students--women, minorities, foreigners, and older students--this stress often includes role conflict in a rapidly changing society. (Hite, 1985; Rimmer, Lammert, & McClain, 1982.) Even for white male students under 25 years of age there are changing expectations such as heavier responsibilities in child care and housework, which may lead to additional stress.

Despite these changes, studies of graduate students are rare. According to Malaney (1987), "studies pertaining to graduate education in general have not been abundant and research specifically related to students has been most lacking" (p. 86). Even when graduate students are included in a larger study of student attitudes, the research report may concentrate on undergraduates, leaving results concerning graduate students buried in supplementary tables without comment. Such was the case in Amos's (1988) report of a study carried out at the University of California-Davis. The few studies which focus on graduate students strongly suggest the need for more research in this area. Rimmer, Lammert, and McClain (1982) found loneliness, anxiety, and role confusion among the doctoral students they studied. They also found different areas of concern among female and minority students than among white males. Hite's (1985) findings were similar. Waggoner, Jordan, Johnsey, and Collier (1989) found that graduate students in education at Memphis State University were dissatisfied with financial aid, with counseling about career opportunities, and with the overall quality of their advisement.

Often assessment instruments have been developed based on logically derived items and categories. The approach reported here emphasized a series of procedures which insured that the items and categories came directly from concerns of the students being studied.

Importance: The preparation of leaders for tomorrow's educational institutions needs to be undertaken in as efficient and effective a way as possible. Assessment of student attitudes, needs, and concerns should be a part of the never-ending process of improving preparation programs. Since institutions vary considerably, one way that valid and reliable instruments can be developed is by combining qualitative and quantitative methods. The categories of the questions asked here were the ones the students themselves determined as important, thus the results should help the College and the various departments make adjustments needed to improve their programs.

METHODOLOGY

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used in developing the final instrument for assessment of College of Education graduate student concerns. In order to obtain maximum validity, four separate processes were utilized over a six-month period in the development of this instrument.

Phase 1--Exploratory Pilot Study: A pilot study was conducted as a part of the requirements of a graduate course in research methods. The class members, who were themselves graduate students in the College of Education, developed a twelve-item questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale. The items were determined by a brainstorming session in the class, and the resulting instrument was administered to a random cluster sample of 173 other graduate students enrolled in classes in a variety of departments in the College of Education during the summer of 1988. While noting the limitations of the sample and the instrument, the research team found interesting results. For example, they found that students were more satisfied with their instruction than with the way programs were administered. They also found several differences in satisfaction on some variables depending on the demographic group--degree program, department, gender of respondent, racial group, etc. They considered the results interesting enough to justify studying the topic in greater depth.

Phase 2--A Qualitative View: During the Fall term of 1988, fifteen graduate students from the College of Education were interviewed for approximately one hour each, using a schedule adapted from the pilot study questionnaire. Expanded accounts of the interviewer's notes were analyzed, using an analytic

induction technique. In addition to the concerns expressed in the pilot study, the subjects reported stress related to insufficient money and time, concern about their advisors, and the belief that part-time study is less satisfactory than full-time. Expansion of the demographic section of the instrument was also recommended.

Phase 3--An Open-ended Intermediate Questionnaire: Based on the initial exploratory questionnaire and the results of the qualitative interviews, an open-ended questionnaire was developed, using the broad categories identified in the earlier inquiries. Approximately 100 students from a cross-section of classes completed this new instrument early in Spring Semester, 1989. Triangulation of data from Phases 1-3 was used to develop the final questionnaire.

Phase 4--The Final Questionnaire: A 77-item, Likert-type instrument with 15 demographic variables was developed based on the first three phases of the study. The 77 items were from five major categories of interest: administration (13 items), faculty (17 items), courses/curriculum (19 items), facilities (24 items), and personal concerns (4 items). All of the items were developed as a result of the processes in the first three phases and reflected the thinking and concerns of the students at this university. Responses to the 77 items were on a scale of 1 (Needs extensive improvement) to 5 (Is very good). Additionally, 15 demographic items were included so that sub-groups could be considered. A final open-ended question provided the opportunity for additional comments. The instrument was then further field tested on a small sample at a different, similar university, primarily to check for clarity and readability. Finally, a random, cluster sample of 408 graduate students (approximately half the enrollment) in the UTK College of Education completed the questionnaire. Questionnaires were distributed in classes and mailed to students registered for dissertation credit. See Appendix A for a copy of the final questionnaire.

Data Source: The students in graduate programs in the College of Education at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, were the source of the data for this study. Other institutions which follow this approach to assess their students' concerns should develop their own instruments, because the issues may vary from university to university. Professors of a cross-section of graduate classes were asked to administer the instrument during Spring Semester, 1989, classes. Students registered for dissertation credit were mailed questionnaires. Both the in-class group and the mailed group were asked to complete the anonymous questionnaires only once. Financial support for the final two phases of the study was provided by the Bureau of Educational Research and Service of the UTK College of Education.

Data Reporting: Although responses to the questionnaires were anonymous, 15 demographic variables were collected, including department and degree program. In order to make the data most useful to the departments without unnecessary, possibly negative comparisons, the data were reported in a coded format. These codes were assigned at random so that no one other than the research team knew the identity of the departments. As a further protection, the data were reported in percents rather than in frequencies so that departmental identity could not be guessed from the size of the unit. Only the heads of the individual departments were given their code so that they could see how their students evaluated the various parts of their program. While the Dean's Office received the complete report, departmental anonymity was maintained. See Appendix B for a copy of the letter of assurance sent to department heads. Because of the small number of responses from one department, that unit received a special report not included in this document. Data from that department were included in the overall college calculations.

FINDINGS

Overall Results: The graduate students enrolled in the UTK College of Education during the Spring Semester of 1989 were most satisfied with the faculty they encountered in their programs (M=3.49). The other four dimensions were in order: curriculum (M=3.11), personal satisfaction (M=3.07), facilities (M=2.83), and administration (M=2.40). On the 5-point Likert scale anything below 3.0 is below acceptable. The items which made up these scales were:

Faculty--questions 17-24 (19 items),
Curriculum--questions 8-16 (17 items),
Personal satisfaction--questions 33-35 (4 items),
Facilities--questions 25-32 (24 items),
Administration--questions 1-7 (13 items). (See questionnaire in Appendix A.)

Table 1 displays the means for these scaled categories for each of the departments and for the entire college. While there were 408 total responses, the means for individual items were usually based on fewer responses than that number since "no opinion" or "not applicable" were possible choices.

All departmental groups (including those in "others", who were primarily students from other colleges and those who had not decided on a program) were in agreement on their highest and lowest categories--faculty and administration respectively. It must be noted that even for the highest scales for all groups no rating averaged as high as 4.0 on the 5-point scale, leaving considerable room for improvement.

Table 1

Student Means for the Five Sub-scales of Areas of Concern, UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

Department	Areas Admin.	Curr.	Faculty	Facil.	Pers.
A	2.64	3.34	3.64	2.79	3.27
B	2.30	3.07	3.35	2.89	3.12
C	2.11	2.37	3.47	2.64	2.83
D	2.33	3.22	3.59	2.87	3.16
E	2.43	3.16	3.36	3.13	3.04
F	2.48	2.90	3.38	2.53	2.90
G	2.57	3.09	3.86	3.01	3.06
Others	2.42	2.65	3.25	2.88	2.68
COLLEGE	**2.40**	**3.11**	**3.49**	**2.83**	**3.07**

When the five major areas of concern were divided into the individual items, further insights into student concerns could be obtained. Table 2 presents the means for each item in the questionnaire for all students and for doctoral (N=145) and MS/EdS (N=208) students as separate groups. Students from other colleges and those who had not been admitted to a degree program are included in the college means but not in the degree groups. Items are abbreviated in the table. For complete item wording, see the questionnaire in Appendix A.

One item in the administrative area (registration) was given a positive rating (3.37). Only three others (admissions clarity --3.12, admissions efficiency--3.05, and tuition--2.80) were near the acceptable level. All other administrative items were negative, with financial aid items being the most negative. A comparison of the doctoral and the MS/EdS students reveals that the two groups were in agreement on the administrative items except for tuition and course frequency, where the doctoral students were more positive.

The curriculum items were rated acceptable or better except for summer term course availability (2.56), doctoral residency requirements (2.79), and doctoral seminars (2.74). Doctoral students were more positive about course frequency and the residency requirement and less positive about doctoral seminars than were MS/EdS students. The highest rated items in the curriculum area were quality of the major courses (3.63), quality of courses taken outside the College (3.59), course relevance (3.53), theoretical content of courses (3.52), and grading practices (3.52).

As previously mentioned, the faculty received the highest

Table 2

Item Means in Five Areas of Concern,
UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

Areas/Items	College Means	Doctoral Students' Means	MS/EdS Students' Means
Administration (Questions 1-7)			
Admissions clarity	3.12	3.19	3.06
Admiss. efficiency	3.05	3.06	3.03
Student orientation	2.33	2.33	2.27
Registration	3.37	3.48	3.24
Reasonable tuition	2.80	2.94	2.70
Student act. fee	2.44	2.47	2.36
Fin. aid publicity	1.99	1.90	1.89
Fin. aid available	2.02	1.89	1.98
Fin. aid amounts	2.09	1.92	2.08
Fin. aid counseling	2.20	2.04	2.22
Assist'ships avail.	2.64	2.52	2.67
Assist'ships amt.	2.39	2.14	2.56
Placement services	2.51	2.40	2.53
Curriculum (Questions 8-16)			
Major course qual.	3.63	3.69	3.63
Oth. COE courses	3.38	3.36	3.43
Courses outside COE	3.59	3.73	3.51
Course relevance	3.53	3.64	3.52
Course frequency	2.83	2.97	2.72
Time courses offer.	2.94	3.06	2.84
No content dupl.	3.15	3.13	3.18
Theoretical content	3.52	3.58	3.54
Practical content	3.32	3.35	3.36
Balance theo-pract.	3.29	3.39	3.26
Summer course avil.	2.56	2.66	2.49
Emph. on writing	3.37	3.44	3.37
Emph. on "hands-on"	2.97	2.95	2.99
Grading	3.52	3.63	3.51
Clear prog. requir.	3.32	3.25	3.40
Doc. resid. requir.	2.79	2.81	2.65
Doc. seminars	2.74	2.67	2.95
Faculty (Questions 17-24)			
Advisor's available	3.82	4.03	3.69
Adv. helpfulness	3.96	4.11	3.88
Adv. knowledge	4.22	4.37	4.14
Adv. mentoring	3.74	3.86	3.67
Adv. instruction	3.95	4.12	3.83
Adv. involv. res.	3.34	3.57	3.10
Adv. involv. prof.	3.36	3.42	3.28
Adv. involv. publ.	3.22	3.27	3.12
Dept. prof. avail.	3.57	3.59	3.55
Dept. prof. knowl.	3.99	4.06	3.98

Table 2 (continued)

Item Means ...

Areas/Items	College Means	Doctoral Students' Means	MS/EdS Students' Means
Faculty (continued)			
Dept. prof. instr.	3.76	3.75	3.76
Dept. prof. res.	3.13	2.98	3.21
Oth. prof. avail.	3.31	3.31	3.30
Oth. prof. know.	3.74	3.80	3.72
Oth. prof. instr.	3.55	3.59	3.53
Fac/stud. interact.	3.23	3.17	3.26
Psyc. support	3.35	3.26	3.38
Advisement	3.26	3.17	3.34
Career guidance	2.89	2.87	2.93
Facilities (Questions 25-32)			
Classrooms/labs	3.19	3.11	3.25
Furniture	3.08	2.97	3.14
Student offices	2.88	2.73	2.93
Student lounges	2.76	2.56	2.86
Student storage	2.49	2.45	2.46
Athletic/recreation	3.53	3.52	3.49
Cleanliness	3.46	3.45	3.50
Day parking	1.40	1.39	1.35
Evening parking	2.70	2.67	2.67
GA parking	1.63	1.51	1.50
Equipment	3.10	3.05	3.12
Microcomputers	3.05	3.15	2.92
Library collection	3.53	3.36	3.64
Library hours	3.74	3.69	3.75
Library orientation	3.49	3.65	3.38
Library staff	3.93	4.01	3.89
Library parking	1.93	1.78	1.87
Vending areas	3.14	3.12	3.12
Cafeteria conven.	3.26	3.37	3.16
Cafe. food quality	2.96	3.04	2.86
Cafeteria hours	3.10	3.12	3.07
Cafe. attractive	2.93	2.91	2.91
Adequate housing	2.91	2.94	2.77
Access to housing	3.01	3.08	2.85
Personal concerns (Questions 33-35)			
Stud-stud. interact.	3.08	3.01	3.10
Tailored program	3.06	3.15	2.97
Social time	2.95	2.88	2.95
Course req. time	3.23	3.33	3.15

ratings. The weakest rated items for faculty were departmental faculty involvement of non-advisees in their research (3.13) and career guidance from faculty (2.89), both of which were in the acceptable range. Highest rated items were advisor's knowledge (4.22), knowledge of other departmental faculty (3.99), advisor's helpfulness (3.96), instruction by advisor (3.95), and advisor's availability (3.82). Doctoral students were more positive than were MS/EdS students on most items. Exceptions were willingness of non-advisors in the department to involve them in research, faculty-student interaction, psychological support from the faculty and peers, and the quality of advisement. It is possible that expectations (with less than complete fulfillment) of doctoral students in these areas are higher, and therefore they rated the items lower.

As might have been predicted, parking was the lowest area, not only for the facilities section but also for the entire survey. While it could have been argued that there was no need to include these items since there is little likelihood that anything can be done about the problem by the College, the omission of this topic would have caused the survey to lack credibility with student respondents; since parking IS the number one problem encountered by most students at UT and most other large universities. Library items (except parking), athletic/ recreation facilities, and cleanliness of facilities were given the highest ratings (all above 3.40). In addition to parking (day parking was 1.40 and graduate assistant parking was 1.63.), student storage for materials (2.49) and student lounges (2.76) were given the weakest ratings. Doctoral students were more negative about classroom and lab facilities, student offices, and student lounges than were the MS/EdS students. The reverse was true for cafeteria convenience and adequacy of campus housing.

The final area addressed was the students' personal concerns. All four items in this area were given adequate or slightly higher ratings. The strongest score was for time to complete course requirements (3.23), although the MS/EdS students (3.15) rated the item lower than did the doctoral students (3.33). At least part of the explanation for this difference is related to the fact that many of the MS/EdS students are part-time, while the doctoral students are more likely to be full-time.

Demographic Groups: Several major demographic groups were compared here to ascertain if there are different concerns among the several groups. There were more female than male respondents (66.3% to 33.7%). This reflects the change in the enrollment in recent years. Most of the subjects were white (92.9%); 5.2% were black and 1.9% were from other racial groups. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents were graduate assistants (24.4%). The age distribution of the students was as follows: less than 26--

20.7%, 26-35--33.6%, 36-45--34.3%, and over 45--11.4%. Table 3 displays the means for gender, race, and graduate assistant status. For discussion purposes, means closer than .20 will be considered in agreement. Based on this criterion, males and females agreed on all except 11 of the 77 items. However, blacks and whites were more than .20 apart on 31 items and GAs differed from non-GAs on 20.

Gender. In the administrative area, both women and men indicated that they felt that the tuition and the four financial aid questions were less than acceptable; however, the female students were more negative than their male counterparts on all five items. There were only two differences in the curriculum area. Women students rated "hands-on" emphasis higher than did the men, although both groups rated this aspect of their courses in the acceptable range. Women rated the doctoral seminars as less than acceptable, while the men put them in the acceptable range. There were no differences of .20 or more in the female/male ratings on the faculty items. Men rated four of the facility items higher than did the women--GA parking, library staff, adequacy of housing, and access to housing. In all four cases the ratings were in the same direction on the scale with only a difference in the strength of the rating. There were also no differences in the personal concerns area.

Race. In the administrative area, black students were more positive than white students on three items. (Races other than black and white were not calculated because there were only ten students, half of whom left the item blank, who were not in these two categories.) Blacks were more positive on financial aid publicity and availability and on assistantship availability. Neither group gave these items high ratings, although the black group put the assistantship availability in the acceptable range. There were differences on five items in the curriculum area. White students rated all five higher than did black students. The areas were courses outside the college, times courses are offered, summer course availability, emphasis on "hands-on" activities, and value of the doctoral seminars. Black and white students differed on seven of the items regarding the faculty, with the white students giving the faculty higher ratings on six of these items than did the black students. Those items rated higher by the whites were advisor involvement of students in research, availability to students of professors from other departments, knowledge of professors from other departments, instructional quality of professors from other departments, faculty-student interaction, and psychological support. The item where the black students gave the faculty a higher rating than did the white students was advisor involvement of students in professional activities. There were 13 items where these groups differed on facilities issues--ten where black students were more positive and three where white students were more positive.

Table 3
Item Means in Five Areas of Concern
By Respondents in Gender, Race, and GA Status
Groups, UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

Areas/Items	Female Means (N=269)	Male Means (N=137)	Black Means (N=21)	White Means (N=377)	GA's Means (N=99)	Non-GA's (N=307)
Administration (Items 1-7)						
Admiss. clarity	3.11	3.14	3.00	3.12	3.02	3.15
Admiss. efficiency	3.05	3.06	3.00	3.04	2.87	3.10
Orientation	2.31	2.39	2.13	2.32	2.52	2.26
Registration	3.37	3.36	3.33	3.36	3.29	3.39
Reasonable tuition	2.73	2.94	2.75	2.79	3.01	2.73
Student activity fee	2.39	2.57	2.29	2.46	2.57	2.40
Fin. aid publicity	1.89	2.19	2.25	1.94	2.19	1.91
Fin. aid availability	1.92	2.24	2.26	1.98	2.11	1.99
Fin. aid amounts	2.02	2.25	2.21	2.06	2.13	2.08
Fin. aid counseling	2.10	2.40	2.21	2.19	2.31	2.17
Assist'ships available	2.70	2.57	3.06	2.62	3.17	2.36
Assist'ships amount	2.42	2.35	2.44	2.37	2.51	2.32
Placement services	2.52	2.49	2.45	2.50	2.67	2.45
Curriculum (Items 8-16)						
Major course qual.	3.66	3.56	3.52	3.62	3.56	3.65
Other COE course qual.	3.38	3.37	3.29	3.38	3.32	3.39
Outside COE course qual.	3.55	3.66	3.00	3.62	3.60	3.59
Course relevance	3.55	3.52	3.35	3.54	3.57	3.52
Course frequency	2.82	2.84	2.67	2.83	2.76	2.85
Time course offered	2.94	2.96	2.60	2.96	3.01	2.92
Course duplication	3.21	3.06	3.05	3.16	3.14	3.16
Theoretical content	3.51	3.55	3.38	3.53	3.54	3.52
Practical content	3.33	3.30	3.14	3.33	3.40	3.29
Balance, theo/pract.	3.26	3.36	3.14	3.31	3.28	3.30
Summer term course avail.	2.54	2.61	2.16	2.57	2.46	2.59
Emphasis on writing	3.36	3.39	3.45	3.36	3.34	3.38
Emphasis on "hands-on"	3.04	2.84	2.57	3.00	2.95	2.98
Grading	3.54	3.48	3.38	3.53	3.48	3.53
Clarity, Prog. Require.	3.37	3.25	3.14	3.32	3.26	3.35
Doc. resid. require.	2.76	2.83	3.00	2.77	2.87	2.75
Doc. seminars	2.61	2.93	2.25	2.73	2.60	2.81
Faculty (Items 17-24)						
Advisor's available	3.85	3.78	3.86	3.80	3.86	3.81
Adv. helpfulness	3.93	4.02	3.90	3.96	4.01	3.94
Adv. knowledge of field	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.33	4.18
Adv. mentoring	3.73	3.73	3.62	3.73	3.80	3.72
Adv. instruction	3.93	3.98	4.00	3.93	4.05	3.91
Adv. involved in res.	3.36	3.34	2.91	3.35	3.49	3.29
Adv. other prof. act.	3.42	3.25	3.63	3.34	3.52	3.29
Adv. public./present.	3.28	3.13	3.20	3.23	3.33	3.18
Dept. prof. avail.	3.56	3.60	3.59	3.56	3.68	3.53
Dept. prof. knowl.	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.07	3.96
Dept. prof. instr.	3.76	3.77	3.65	3.76	3.86	3.72
Dept. prof. invol. in res.	3.13	3.16	3.29	3.12	3.22	3.10

Table 3 Continued

Areas/Items	Female Means (N=269)	Male Means (N=137)	Black Means (N=21)	White Means (N=377)	GA's Means (N=99)	Non-GA's (N=307)
Faculty (continued)						
Oth. prof. avail.	3.28	3.38	2.93	3.33	3.39	3.29
Oth. prof. knowl.	3.66	3.84	3.50	3.75	3.73	3.73
Oth. prof. instr.	3.50	3.63	3.21	3.57	3.63	3.52
Fac/stud. interact.	3.23	3.25	2.84	3.25	3.34	3.20
Psyc. support fac/peers	3.37	3.30	2.89	3.37	3.39	3.33
Advisement	3.31	3.17	3.25	3.25	3.27	3.26
Career guidance	2.92	2.83	2.71	2.89	2.84	2.90
Facilities (Items 25-32)						
Classrooms/labs	3.17	3.23	3.45	3.17	3.26	3.17
Furniture	3.04	3.17	3.05	3.08	3.18	3.06
Student offices	2.85	2.95	3.27	2.84	2.96	2.84
Student lounges	2.73	2.84	2.83	2.74	2.56	2.83
Student storage	2.43	2.58	2.27	2.48	2.67	2.40
Athletic/recreation	3.48	3.61	3.18	3.55	3.64	3.49
Cleanliness	3.41	3.57	3.67	3.44	3.54	3.43
Day parking	1.35	1.52	1.15	1.42	1.36	1.42
Evening parking	2.67	2.76	2.65	2.69	2.52	2.75
GA parking	1.55	1.83	1.71	1.61	1.38	1.82
Class/lab equipment	3.08	3.15	3.25	3.09	3.16	3.08
Computer equipment	3.01	3.15	2.87	3.05	3.18	3.01
Library adequacy	3.54	3.51	3.76	3.51	3.32	3.60
Library hours	3.74	3.74	3.95	3.72	3.66	3.76
Library orientation	3.43	3.61	3.53	3.49	3.58	3.46
Library staff	3.85	4.08	4.22	3.92	4.11	3.87
Library parking	1.91	1.95	2.10	1.91	1.65	2.01
Vending areas	3.14	3.13	3.25	3.12	3.13	3.14
Cafeteria convenience	3.22	3.33	3.42	3.25	3.49	3.17
Cafe. food quality	2.93	3.01	3.16	2.94	3.07	2.92
Cafeteria hours	3.10	3.13	3.26	3.09	3.26	3.04
Cafe. attractiveness	2.87	3.04	3.11	2.91	3.05	2.88
Adequate housing	2.79	3.12	3.29	2.83	3.00	2.85
Access to housing	2.93	3.15	3.29	2.95	3.21	2.87
Personal Concerns (Items 25-35)						
Stud/Stud interactions	3.05	3.16	2.67	3.11	3.10	3.08
Tailored program	3.01	3.13	2.60	3.07	2.93	3.10
Social time	2.92	3.02	2.38	2.98	2.63	3.07
Course req. time	3.23	3.24	3.10	3.23	3.04	3.30

Blacks gave higher ratings to classrooms, student offices, building cleanliness, library collection, library hours, library staff, cafeteria food quality, cafeteria attractiveness, adequacy of student housing, and access to student housing. Whites gave higher scores to student storage, athletic-recreational facilities, and daytime parking. In most of these cases there was agreement in direction but differences in strength of feeling. For example, library issues received positive ratings from both groups and parking was rated low by both. Finally, the two groups differed on three of the four personal concerns items, with white students rating student-student interaction, program tailoring, and time for socialization higher than did the black students.

Graduate Assistant status. Non-graduate assistants gave the administration higher marks on admissions matters than did GAs, but on orientation, financial aid, assistantships, and placement services the GAs gave the higher scores. The only item in the curriculum area where there was a difference was the value of the doctoral seminars, with the non-GAs rating them in the acceptable range, while the GAs were more negative about them. GAs felt their advisors involved them in research and in professional activities more than did non-GAs. There were ten items where these two groups differed on facilities items, with each group giving higher ratings to five of them. GAs scored student storage, library staff, cafeteria convenience, cafeteria hours, and access to housing higher than non-GAs. Conversely, non-GAs scored student lounges, evening parking, GA parking, library collection, and library parking higher than did GAs. Most of these differences seem entirely logical in light of the different use of facilities GAs and non-GAs routinely make. Non-GAs were more positive than GAs about the time they had for both socializing and for completion of course requirements. Again, this seems a reasonable reflection of the expectations made on GAs' time for their duties in the College. When asked about whether or not they would be willing to pay extra for the privilege of parking in a lot for graduate students closer to the center of the campus, GAs or students employed on UT-related projects responded 45.1%--yes, 33.6%--no, and 21.3%--not sure. Graduate students who were not employed as GAs or on other UT-related projects responded 37.6%--yes, 33.9%--no, and 28.5%--not sure. Several of those in each group who responded "no" commented that they thought they already paid too much to park.

Age. Respondents were asked to indicate membership in one of five age groups. Since there were only five respondents who fell in the over 55 age group, that category was combined with the 46-54 age group to form the over 45 group. Four students left the age item blank. Mean responses to each of the 77 items for the four age groups are displayed in Table 4. For only three items were there consistent patterns of relative strength of

Table 4
Item Means in Five Areas of Concern
By Respondents' Age Groups, UTK College of Education,
Spring 1989

Areas/Items	Age Group Means <26 (N=84)	26-35 (N=136)	36-45 (N=139)	>45 (N=46)
Admiss. Clarity	3.09	3.23	2.98	3.21
Admiss. efficiency	2.96	3.19	2.95	3.26
Orientation	2.39	2.41	2.19	2.47
Registration	3.32	3.43	3.22	3.63
Reasonable tuition	2.91	2.68	2.82	2.93
Student activity fee	2.45	2.51	2.30	2.72
Fin. aid publicity	2.00	1.99	1.97	2.04
Fin. aid availability	2.12	2.03	1.92	2.18
Fin. aid amounts	2.30	2.00	1.99	2.39
Fin. aid counseling	2.38	2.26	1.98	2.42
Assist'ships available	2.95	2.58	2.48	2.80
Assist'ships amount	2.88	2.30	2.14	2.54
Placement services	2.60	2.54	2.37	2.73
Curriculum (Items 8-16)				
Major course qual.	3.44	3.67	3.65	3.78
Other COE course qual.	3.31	3.43	3.40	3.27
Outside COE course qual.	3.34	3.76	3.51	3.79
Course relevance	3.45	3.59	3.52	3.57
Course frequency	2.89	2.80	2.67	3.30
Time course offered	2.99	2.93	2.80	3.39
Course duplication	3.10	3.20	3.12	3.32
Theoretical content	3.47	3.50	3.57	3.58
Practical content	3.38	3.30	3.29	3.37
Balance, theo/pract.	3.24	3.29	3.29	3.41
Summer term course avail.	2.53	2.60	3.41	2.91
Emphasis on writing	3.31	3.37	3.35	3.54
Emphasis on "hands-on"	3.06	3.03	2.82	3.11
Grading	3.57	3.54	3.41	3.67
Clarity, Prog. Require.	3.29	3.39	3.24	3.43
Doc. resid. require.	2.71	2.80	2.75	2.92
Doc. seminars	2.58	2.86	2.71	2.67
Faculty (Items 17-24)				
Advisor's available	3.68	3.97	3.69	4.07
Adv. helpfulness	3.84	4.12	3.87	3.98
Adv. knowledge of field	4.03	4.30	4.22	4.26
Adv. mentoring	3.69	3.76	3.70	3.82
Adv. instruction	3.78	4.03	3.94	4.00
Adv. involved in res.	3.00	3.44	3.37	3.61
Adv. other prof. act.	3.31	3.34	3.42	3.03
Adv. public./present.	3.09	3.22	3.24	3.34
Dept. prof. avail.	3.64	3.53	3.52	3.71
Dept. prof. knowl.	3.92	3.98	3.96	3.82
Dept. prof. instr.	3.78	3.71	3.75	3.89
Dept. prof. invol. in res.	3.21	3.17	3.07	3.09

Table 4 Continued

Areas/Items	Age Group Means <26 (N=84)	26-35 (N=136)	36-45 (N=139)	>45 (N=46)
Faculty (continued)				
Oth. prof. avail.	3.27	3.37	3.26	3.40
Oth. prof. knowl.	3.66	3.78	3.69	3.82
Oth. prof. instr.	3.41	3.63	3.52	3.59
Fac/stud. interact.	3.39	3.34	2.98	3.39
Psyc. support fac/peers	3.52	3.42	3.13	3.40
Advisement	3.25	3.34	3.12	3.43
Career guidance	2.90	2.96	2.78	2.94
Facilities (Items 25-32)				
Classrooms/labs	3.17	3.27	3.04	3.38
Furniture	3.12	3.14	2.94	3.27
Student offices	2.92	2.98	2.70	3.13
Student lounges	2.71	2.80	2.65	3.11
Student storage	2.50	2.53	2.39	2.64
Athletic/recreation	3.46	3.54	3.49	3.81
Cleanliness	3.53	3.52	3.33	3.50
Day parking	1.47	1.37	1.41	1.41
Evening parking	2.64	2.83	2.62	2.63
GA parking	1.65	1.50	1.62	2.18
Class/lab equipment	3.08	3.18	2.97	3.33
Computer equipment	2.88	3.15	2.95	3.39
Library adequacy	3.40	3.57	3.54	3.63
Library hours	3.71	3.75	3.70	3.85
Library orientation	3.34	3.44	3.57	3.71
Library staff	3.82	3.92	3.97	4.07
Library parking	1.97	1.79	1.91	2.25
Vending areas	3.23	3.21	3.02	3.10
Cafeteria convenience	3.42	3.33	3.08	3.32
Cafe. food quality	3.00	2.92	2.92	3.15
Cafeteria hours	3.35	3.14	2.94	3.00
Cafe. attractiveness	3.08	2.85	2.83	3.15
Adequate housing	3.02	3.06	2.60	3.10
Access to housing	3.02	3.16	2.73	3.40
Personal Concerns (Items 25-35)				
Stud/Stud interactions	3.23	3.15	2.87	3.24
Tailored program	2.97	3.06	2.95	3.43
Social time	2.88	2.93	2.90	3.37
Course req. time	2.99	3.27	3.24	3.53

responses as the ages of the respondents changed. In all three cases--advisor involvement of students in publications and presentations, library orientation, and library staff--the ratings increased for each succeeding age group, although the differences were not extreme. For most items, the over 45 age group was the most positive; while the 36-45 age group was the least positive.

Type Doctoral Program. There were 69 responses from PhD students and 76 from EdD students. Table 5 gives the item means for these two groups. PhD students seemed more positive than EdD students about the administrative items, although only four of the 13 items averaged above 2.80 and only one was above 3.20 for the PhDs. PhD students were also slightly more positive toward the faculty than were EdD students, especially in the areas of advisor involvement in professional matters and publication and in their departmental faculty's involvement of them in research. EdD students were more positive about their curriculum, the facilities, and personal concerns than were PhD students. Most noticeable differences in the curriculum area were higher ratings by EdD students of courses in the College of Education, emphasis on writing, and clarity of course requirements. In the personal concerns category EdD students were more positive about the tailoring of their programs and time to complete their course requirements.

Full-time/Part-time Status. It has often been speculated that part-time students have different problems than do full-time students. Table 6 displays means of selected items by these two groups. There were approximately equal numbers of each group who responded. Of the 47 items selected for this comparison, only 5 of the means were more than .20 apart. All of these items were given more positive scores by the part-time students than the full-time students. The five areas were lack of course content duplication, involvement of students with major professors in research, adequacy of library collection, parking near the library, and time to socialize. As was the case with the doctoral students/master's students comparisons made above, expectation levels may explain these differences as much as or more than actual conditions. Even if this is the case, the differences point to areas needing attention for the benefit of the full-time students.

Departmental Results: Usable returns of the final questionnaire were collected from 408 graduate students enrolled in the UTK College of Education, Spring Semester, 1989. Table 7 displays the number of returns from each department. Because of the limited number of responses from Art and Music Education, no departmental report was completed for them, although their data were included in the total college data. Therefore, only seven departmental reports are found here, coded in random order as

Table 5
Item Means in Five Areas of Concern
Ph.D. and Ed.D

Areas/Items	Ph.D. (N=69)	Ed.D. (N=86)
Administration (Items 1-7)		
Admiss. clarity	3.13	3.24
Admiss. efficiency	2.87	2.62
Orientation	2.48	2.18
Registration	3.27	3.67
Reasonable tuition	3.06	2.82
Student activity fee	2.64	2.29
Fin. aid publicity	1.97	1.83
Fin. aid availability	2.02	1.76
Fin. aid amounts	2.08	1.74
Fin. aid counseling	2.20	1.85
Assist'ships available	2.50	2.54
Assist'ships amount	2.12	2.17
Placement services	2.59	2.25
Curriculum (Items 8-16)		
Major course qual.	3.71	3.66
Other COE course qual.	3.09	3.60
Outside COE course qual.	3.73	3.73
Course relevance	3.61	3.66
Course frequency	2.90	3.04
Time course offered	3.01	3.09
Course duplication	3.06	3.20
Theoretical content	3.59	3.57
Practical content	3.31	3.38
Balance, theo/pract.	3.36	3.42
Summer term course avail.	2.53	2.78
Emphasis on writing	3.24	3.63
Emphasis on "hands-on"	2.92	2.97
Grading	3.54	3.71
Clarity, Prog. Require.	3.12	3.37
Doc. resid. require.	2.73	2.88
Doc. seminars	2.71	2.88
Faculty (Items 17-24)		
Advisor's available	4.07	3.99
Adv. helpfulness	4.16	4.07
Adv. knowledge of field	4.36	4.38
Adv. mentoring	3.78	3.94
Adv. instruction	4.13	4.10
Adv. involved in res.	3.65	3.49
Adv. other prof. act.	3.60	3.23
Adv. public./present.	3.38	3.16
Dept. prof. avail.	3.69	3.50
Dept. prof. knowl.	4.06	4.07
Dept. prof. instr.	3.85	3.67
Dept. prof. invol. in res.	3.17	2.82

Table 5 continued

Areas/Items	Ph.D. (N=69)	Ed.D. (N=86)
Faculty (continued)		
Oth. prof. avail.	3.29	3.32
Oth. prof. knowl.	3.75	3.85
Oth. prof. instr.	3.52	3.85
Fac/stud. interact.	3.16	3.18
Psyc. support fac/peers	3.35	3.17
Advisement	3.09	3.24
Career guidance	2.84	2.89
Facilities (Items 25-32)		
Classrooms/labs	2.87	3.34
Furniture	2.77	3.15
Student offices	2.49	3.00
Student lounges	2.24	2.85
Student storage	2.23	2.66
Athletic/recreation	3.62	3.42
Cleanliness	3.37	3.51
Day parking	1.27	1.49
Evening parking	2.62	2.66
GA parking	1.30	1.74
Class/lab equipment	2.97	3.12
Computer equipment	3.17	3.13
Library adequacy	3.16	3.55
Library hours	3.54	3.84
Library orientation	3.73	3.57
Library staff	4.10	3.92
Library parking	1.66	1.88
Vending areas	2.97	3.26
Cafeteria convenience	3.32	3.41
Cafe. food quality	3.02	3.07
Cafeteria hours	3.00	3.23
Cafe. attractiveness	2.75	3.06
Adequate housing	2.80	3.11
Access to housing	3.02	3.14
Personal Concerns (Items 25-35)		
Stud/Stud interactions	2.97	3.04
Tailored program	3.01	3.28
Social time	2.83	2.93
Course req. time	3.21	3.43

Table 6
A Comparison of Means for Selected Items
for Full- and Part-time Students

Areas/Items	F.T. (>6 hrs.)	P.T. (1-6 hrs.)
Administration (Items 1-7)		
Orientation	2.34	2.32
Registration	3.39	3.35
Reasonable tuition	2.83	2.74
Student activity fee	2.39	2.52
Curriculum (Items 8-16)		
Major course qual.	3.56	3.69
Other COE course qual.	3.33	3.42
Outside COE course qual.	3.61	3.56
Course relevance	3.53	3.53
Course frequency	2.78	2.86
Time course offered	2.90	2.97
Course duplication	3.05	3.26
Theoretical content	3.53	3.50
Practical content	3.33	3.30
Balance, theo/pract.	3.27	3.31
Summer term course avail.	2.47	2.62
Emphasis on writing	3.37	3.36
Emphasis on "hands-on"	2.97	2.96
Grading	3.52	3.52
Clarity, Prog. Require.	3.24	3.40
Faculty (Items 17-24)		
Advisor's available	3.81	3.82
Adv. helpfulness	3.93	3.93
Adv. knowledge of field	4.26	4.17
Adv. mentoring	3.75	3.72
Adv. instruction	3.93	3.95
Adv. involved in res.	3.22	3.45
Adv. other prof. act.	3.30	3.40
Adv. public./present.	3.20	3.22
Oth. prof. avail.	3.61	3.53
Oth. Prof. Knowl.	4.05	3.92
Oth. prof. instr.	3.76	3.75
Oth. prof. invol. in res.	3.05	3.22
Fac/stud. interact.	3.26	3.20
Psyc. support fac/peers	3.42	3.26
Advisement	3.23	3.28
Career guidance	2.86	2.94
Facilities (Items 25-32)		
Day parking	1.33	1.48
Evening parking	2.63	2.76
Library collection	3.41	3.65
Library hours	3.67	3.80
Library orientation	3.47	3.49
Library staff	4.02	3.84
Library parking	1.72	2.13
Vending areas	3.14	3.14

Table 6 continued

Areas/Items	F.T. (>6 hrs.)	P.T. (1-6 hrs.)
Personal Concerns (Items 25-35)		
Stud/Stud interactions	3.07	3.08
Tailored program	2.99	3.11
Social time	2.77	3.17
Course req. time	3.17	3.32

Table 7

Number of Students Who Responded to Graduate Student Concerns Questionnaire, UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

Department	Number of Respondents
Art & Music	4
Curriculum & Instruction	91
Educ. & Counseling Psych.	64
Educational Leadership	70
Health, Leisure & Safety	42
Physical Educ. & Dance	29
Special Services Education	26
Technological & Adult Educ.	56
Other	26

departments A through G. Data were reviewed for each of the seven departments for each item.

Students in Department A were more positive than the average of their peers in the College on the following items:

1. The course quality in their major;
2. The frequency, times, and summer offerings of courses in their department;
3. The practical content of the courses in their department
4. The emphasis on writing in their program;
5. The residency requirement;
6. Advisor mentoring;
7. Opportunities for faculty-student interaction;
8. Facilities--student offices and secure storage;
9. Microcomputer availability;
10. Adequacy of library collection;
11. Access to student housing; and
12. Sufficient time to do course work.

Students in Department A did not rate any items lower than the average of their peers. Full-time students in Department A were more positive than part-time students on: registration efficiency, tuition costs, frequency of course offerings, time of course offerings, availability of summer courses, appropriate emphasis on writing, mentoring received from the major professor, and psychological support from faculty and peers. Part-time students rated library collection, hours, and parking higher than did full-time students.

Students in Department B were more positive than the average on the following:

1. Summer term course availability,

2. Doctoral residence requirements,
3. Facilities--classrooms and furniture, and
4. Parking for GAs and students working on UT-sponsored projects.

Students in Department B rated the following items lower than the average of their peers:

1. Orientation of new students,
2. Advisors' mentoring,
3. Major professors' involvement of students in publications and conference presentations,
4. Involvement of students in research of other professors in the department,
5. Opportunities for faculty-student interaction, and
6. Psychological support from faculty and peers.

Doctoral students in Department B gave especially low ratings to new student orientation. While students in this department gave higher than average ratings to parking for GAs, they still rated this item 2.0 on a 5-point scale. While lower than the average in the College, the mentoring item was still well above 3.0; the high positive items on facilities were between 3.4 and 3.6. All other exceptional items for the department were near the 3.0 point. Part-time students in Department B gave 23 of the 77 items higher ratings than did the full-time students. There were no items where the full-time students in the department gave higher ratings by more than .20. Included in the items rated higher by the part-time students were: student orientation; activities fees; course quality, frequency, and time of offering; clarity of program requirements; advisors' availability, helpfulness, knowledge, and involvement in research; departmental members' availability and instructional ability; faculty/student interaction; psychological support from faculty and peers; adequate advisement and career guidance; parking; library orientation; and time to socialize.

Department C was below the College mean on 23 items and above the mean on 7. Below average ratings were given to: clarity and efficiency of admissions; registration efficiency; tuition and activities fees; course quality in the major and in courses outside the College; emphasis on writing; doctoral residency and seminar requirements; advisors' availability and involvement of students in research; other departmental members' involvement of students in research; evening parking; availability of microcomputers; adequacy of library collection, hours, orientation, staff, and parking; quality of cafeteria food, tailoring of academic program; and sufficient time to complete course requirements. Higher than College average ratings were given to: orientation of new students, availability of financial aid, advisors' mentoring, availability of professors in other departments in the College, advisement and career guidance, and quality of classroom furniture. It may be observed that on the curricular and faculty items where the means

for Department C were below the College means they were 3.0 or higher on all except the doctoral residency and seminar requirements and research involvement of the students by faculty.

Department D rated 9 items lower than the College average and 2 higher than the mean. Five of the items rated lower than average were in the curriculum/courses area: frequency of offerings, practical content, balance between theoretical and practical content, emphasis on "hands-on" learning, and doctoral residency requirement. The other four below average items were: new student orientation, adequacy of student offices, and food quality and hours of the cafeterias. The two higher than average ratings went to student lounges and sufficient time to socialize. All of the items regarding faculty were near the College average for Department D. On 25 items the part-time students in Department D were more positive than were the full-time students. On only one item (library staff) were the full-time students more positive. The items rated higher by the part-time students were: new student orientation; registration efficiency; courses in other departments; course frequency, time of offering, lack of duplication, and summer availability; emphasis on "hands-on" learning; grading; clear program requirements; advisors' availability, mentoring, instructional ability, and involvement of students (in research, professional activities, and publication); faculty/student interaction; advisement and career guidance; day parking; library collection, hours, and parking; tailoring of academic program to students' needs; and time to socialize.

Department E had 4 items rated higher than the College average and 5 rated lower than the average. The higher rated items were: availability of assistantships, doctoral residency and seminar requirements, and the availability of secure storage for students. The lower than average items were: job placement assistance; advisors' instructional ability; and knowledge of field, instructional ability, and involvement of students in research of departmental faculty other than the advisor. All of the items in the curriculum/course area were near or above the College mean, but four of the five below average items were in the faculty area. On 18 items the full-time students in Department E scored higher than the part-time students, while the reverse was true on 8 items. Full-time students were higher on: new student orientation (part-time students gave this item a mean of only 1.70!); activities fees; courses outside the department; frequency of course offerings; clarity of program requirements; involvement of students with major professors in publication; departmental faculty availability and knowledge in their field; faculty/student interaction; psychological support of faculty and peers; evening parking; library orientation, staff, and parking; vending areas; student/student interaction; tailoring of academic program to individual student needs; and time to complete course

requirements. Part-time students in Department E rated these items higher: course quality in the major; relevance, lack of duplication in content, practicality, and balance of content between theoretical and practical in courses; advisors' mentoring and involvement of students in research; and involvement of departmental faculty other than the advisor of students in research.

Department F had 18 items which were rated lower than the College average and 6 rated above the mean. The 18 lower ratings were: availability of assistantships; course quality in other departments in the College; frequency and time of course offerings; course availability in the summer; emphasis on writing; helpfulness and mentorship of advisors; advisement and career guidance; adequacy of classroom furniture, student offices, lounges, and secure storage; parking for GAs; classroom equipment; and the library collection. The above average items were: involvement of departmental faculty of students in research, convenience of cafeterias, opportunities for student/student interaction, tailoring of academic program to individual student needs, and time both for socialization and the completion of course requirements. Department F was above average on all four of the personal concern items. They rated the facility items low more than any other area. While two items in the faculty area regarding advisors were below the College average, they were both above 3.40. There were 13 items rated higher by the part-time students than by the full-time students; 8 items were favored by the full-time students. Part-time students rated higher: admissions efficiency; orientation of new students; publicity about financial aid; frequency of course offerings; summer course offerings; clarity of program requirements; adequacy of classroom furniture, student lounges, and secure storage; parking for GAs; classroom equipment; and time for both socialization and to complete course requirements. Full-time students favored: tuition amount; advisors' availability, helpfulness, and knowledge of field; psychological support from faculty and peers; library orientation and staff; and access to student housing.

Twenty-one of the means for Department G were higher than the College means and 10 were lower. The higher ones were: new student orientation; availability of assistantships; course quality in the major department; emphasis on writing; advisors' availability, helpfulness, knowledge of field, mentorship, and instructional ability; availability, knowledge of their field, instructional ability, and involvement of students in their research of departmental faculty; advisement; adequacy of classroom furniture and student secure storage; convenience, quality of food, hours, and attractiveness of cafeterias; and opportunities for student/student interaction. Lower than average ratings were given to: availability, size, and

counseling about financial aid grants; parking in the evening, for GAs, and at the library; adequacy of the library collection; adequacy of and access to student housing; and time to complete course requirements. As these data show, the students in Department G were very positive about their professors.

SUMMARY

While interesting, some of the results of this survey of graduate student concerns are in areas where the College may have little or no direct ability to bring about improvement. Even in these areas it may be possible that College leaders can exert some influence on the appropriate university officials to bring about long-range improvement in graduate programs and graduate student life. It is unlikely that graduate students in other colleges are without some of the same concerns. For example, a proposal to assist graduate students to get more favorable parking (relative to undergraduates) might be favorably received by the parking authority. An option for graduate students to pay an additional fee to park in centrally located lots (perhaps along with seniors) would apparently appeal to some of the College of Education graduate students. Or consideration for GAs and others on UT-related projects (i.e. on the UT payroll) to be allowed staff parking could be supported by the College administration. Is it not reasonable for part-time professional employees (GAs) to have the same parking privileges as part-time clerical staff? Requests for such consideration from the College would certainly have more weight than they would from the students themselves.

Various departments may wish to address areas of special concern to their students. Even in some of the areas where the departments are at or above the College means, there is plenty of room for improvement.

The most positive ratings were given to the faculty area. The top five were:

1. Advisor's knowledge of field (M = 4.22). One department (G) was exceptionally high on this item with a mean of 4.64.
2. Departmental faculty's knowledge of field (M = 3.99). Department G rated this item 4.41.
3. Advisor's helpfulness (M = 3.96). Department G rated this item 4.46, while department F was low with a 3.70 mean.
4. Advisor's instructional ability (M = 3.95). Again department G was above the average (4.39). Department E was below average with a mean of 3.68.
5. Advisor's availability (M = 3.82). Department G was higher than the average with a mean of 4.14, and department C was lower than average with a mean of 3.42.

College of Education graduate students were generally pleased with admissions, registration, and the library. The evaluation of their courses and curriculum were also at the level of acceptable or better. They were not pleased with parking and financial aid.

On a College-wide basis there are a number of areas which seem to call for action. Some of the lowest-rated items may be addressed immediately; others may require long-range efforts. Among the most obvious are:

1. Orientation of new students (M = 2.33). Departments B and D may need to give special attention to this item since their means were 2.03 and 1.92 respectively. While departments C and G were in the acceptable range (M = 3.00), they could also improve on this item.
2. Financial aid publicity (M = 1.99). All departments seemed low in this item.
3. Placement services (M = 2.51). All departments were low, but department E was especially low (M = 2.25).
4. Frequency of course offerings (M = 2.83). Departments D and F were lower than the others (M = 2.52). Department A was above the acceptable level with a mean of 3.10.
5. Times courses are offered (M = 2.94). Department A had a mean of 3.20 on this item.
6. Summer course availability (M = 2.56). Departments A and B were closer to the acceptable mark (M = 2.82 and 2.97) than the College average, but department F was lower than average with a mean of 2.12.
7. Doctoral residency requirements (M = 2.79). Three departments (A, B, and E) were in the acceptable range on this item, but two were even lower than the average--departments C (2.00) and D (2.17).
8. Doctoral seminars (M = 2.74). One department (E, 3.00) rated this item acceptable; one (C, 2.25) was lower than the College average.
9. Career guidance (M = 2.89). Only department C (3.30) scored above the acceptable level. Department F was the lowest on this item with a mean of 2.61.
10. Student offices (M = 2.88). Responses ranged from a high by students in department A (3.13) to a low from those in department F (2.47).
11. Student lounges (M = 2.76). Department D rated this item 3.11, while department F rated it 2.20.
12. Secure storage for student materials (M = 2.49). Departments E (3.07), G (2.80), and A (2.78) were somewhat higher than the College average on this item. Department F gave it the lowest rating (2.07).

References

Amos, A.K., Jr. (1988). The Davis Academic Environment. A Report of Student Opinions. Davis, CA: University of California-Davis Office of Student Affairs Research and Information. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 918).

Hite, L. M. (1985). Female doctoral students: their perceptions and concerns. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 18-22.

Malaney, G. D. (1987). Who receives financial support to pursue graduate study? Research in Higher Education, 26, 85-97.

Rimmer, S. M.; Lammert, M.; & McClain, P. (1982). An assessment of graduate student needs. College Student Journal, 16, 187-196.

Schneider, B. L. (1984). Graduate programs in schools of education: facing tomorrow, today. New Directions for Higher Education, 12, 57-63.

Waggoner, J.E., Jordan, C., Johnsey, A.L., & Collier, J.C. (1989, November). Graduate Students: A Dichotomy of Perceptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock, AR.

APPENDIX A

GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY

UTK COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This survey is part of a study to determine student satisfaction and concerns with graduate education in the College of Education at UTK. The results are intended to produce recommendations for ways to improve the quality of graduate student life. Your anonymous, candid responses will be appreciated. Participation is voluntary, but we hope you will give us your opinions. Reports will be made to each department and to the college administration in such a way that individuals cannot be identified. Departmental data will be reported in such a way that only the departments themselves will know which is their unit.

Please circle the number on the 1 - 5 scale for each item below where 1 = Needs extensive improvement, 3 = Acceptable, and 5 = Very good. If you have no opinion (NO) or an item is not applicable (NA) to you, check the blank at the right of each scale. **THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.**

	Needs Extensive Improvement		Is Acceptable		Is Very Good	NO or NA
1. The admissions process						
a. clarity	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. efficiency	1	2	3	4	5	___
2. Orientation of new students	1	2	3	4	5	___
3. Course registration efficiency	1	2	3	4	5	___
4. Reasonableness of fees						
a. tuition/maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. student activities	1	2	3	4	5	___
5. Financial aid						
a. publicity	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. availability of grants	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. size of grants	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. counseling	1	2	3	4	5	___
6. Dept./college assistantships						
a. availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. amount paid	1	2	3	4	5	___
7. Job placement services	1	2	3	4	5	___
8. Course quality in major	1	2	3	4	5	___

CONTINUE ON BACK

	Needs Extensive Improvement		Is Acceptable		Is Very Good	NO or NA
9. Course quality in other College of Education departments	1	2	3	4	5	___
10. Course quality outside College of Education	1	2	3	4	5	___
11. Graduate courses at UTK						
a. relevance	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. frequency of offering	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. times offered	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. avoidance of content duplication	1	2	3	4	5	___
e. theoretical content	1	2	3	4	5	___
f. practical content	1	2	3	4	5	___
g. balanced between the theoretical & practical	1	2	3	4	5	___
h. summer term availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
12. Emphasis on writing activities	1	2	3	4	5	___
13. Emphasis on "Hands-On" experiences	1	2	3	4	5	___
14. Grading	1	2	3	4	5	___
15. Clarity of program requirements	1	2	3	4	5	___
16. Doctoral						
a. residency requirements	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. seminars	1	2	3	4	5	___
17. My Advisor's						
a. availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. helpfulness	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. knowledge of field	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. mentoring	1	2	3	4	5	___
e. instruction	1	2	3	4	5	___
18. Degree to which my major professor involves me in						
a. research	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. other professional activities/associations	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. publications/presentations	1	2	3	4	5	___

GO TO NEXT PAGE

	Needs Extensive Improvement		Is Acceptable		Is Very Good	NO or NA
19. Other professors in my department						
a. availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. knowledge of field	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. as instructors	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. involve students in their research	1	2	3	4	5	___
20. Professors in other departments in the college						
a. availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. knowledge of field	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. as instructors	1	2	3	4	5	___
21. Opportunities for faculty-student interaction	1	2	3	4	5	___
22. Psychological support from faculty and peers	1	2	3	4	5	___
23. Advisement (direction of program)	1	2	3	4	5	___
24. Career guidance	1	2	3	4	5	___
25. Facilities (buildings)						
a. classrooms and labs	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. classroom furniture	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. student offices	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. student lounges	1	2	3	4	5	___
e. secure storage for student materials	1	2	3	4	5	___
f. athletic/recreational facilities	1	2	3	4	5	___
g. cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	___
26. Parking						
a. during the day	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. evenings	1	2	3	4	5	___
27. Parking for GA's/students working on UT-sponsored projects	1	2	3	4	5	___

CONTINUE ON BACK

	Needs Extensive Improvement		Is Acceptable		Is Very Good	NO or NA
28. Equipment						
a. in classrooms and labs	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. microcomputer availability	1	2	3	4	5	___
29. The Library						
a. adequacy of collection	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. hours	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. orientation	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. knowledgeable and helpful staff	1	2	3	4	5	___
e. nearby parking	1	2	3	4	5	___
30. Vending areas	1	2	3	4	5	___
31. On-Campus eating facilities						
a. convenience	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. food quality	1	2	3	4	5	___
c. hours	1	2	3	4	5	___
d. attractiveness	1	2	3	4	5	___
32. Housing for graduate students						
a. adequacy	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. access	1	2	3	4	5	___
33. Opportunities for student-student interactions	1	2	3	4	5	___
34. Tailoring of academic programs to student needs	1	2	3	4	5	___
35. Sufficient time						
a. for social interaction	1	2	3	4	5	___
b. to complete course requirements	1	2	3	4	5	___

Please also complete the following personal items to help us interpret the responses to the previous assessments.

36. Your degree program:
___ 1. Ph.D.
___ 2. Ed.D.
___ 3. Ed.S.
___ 4. M.S.
___ 5. Certification
___ 6. Unclassified
___ 7. Other, Specify _____

GO TO NEXT PAGE

37. Major department
___ 1. Art and Music Education
___ 2. Curriculum and Instruction
___ 3. Educational and Counseling Psychology
___ 4. Educational Leadership
___ 5. Health, Leisure, and Safety
___ 6. Physical Education and Dance
___ 7. Special Services Education
___ 8. Technological and Adult Education
___ 9. Other, Specify _____

38. Do you have a major advisor designated?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

If yes, approximately how many hours had you completed when advisor was designated?_____

39. Number of hours enrolled for this semester
___ 1. fewer than 4
___ 2. 4-6
___ 3. 7-9
___ 4. more than 9

40. Number semester hours completed prior to this term in major
___ 1. fewer than 12
___ 2. 12-24
___ 3. more than 24

41. Number UTK graduate semester hours completed prior to this term in College of Education departments other than major
___ 1. fewer than 6
___ 2. 6-12
___ 3. more than 12

42. Number of UTK graduate semester hours completed prior to this term outside the College of Education

___ 1. fewer than 6
___ 2. 6-12
___ 3. more than 12

43. Are you a graduate assistant?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

44. Are you employed on a UT-related project?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

CONTINUE ON BACK

45. Would you be willing to pay an additional fee for the privilege of parking in a lot designated for graduate students closer to the campus center?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No
    ___ 3. Not sure

46. Gender
    ___ 1. Female
    ___ 2. Male

47. Racial/Ethnic Group
    ___ 1. Black
    ___ 2. Hispanic
    ___ 3. White
    ___ 4. Other, specify _____

48. Age
    ___ 1. under 26
    ___ 2. 26-35
    ___ 3. 36-45
    ___ 4. 46-55
    ___ 5. over 55

49. Did you come from outside the Knoxville area to attend U.T.?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

50. Do you live in U.T. housing?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

51. Additional comments:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

APPENDIX B

M E M O R A N D U M

College of Education

Department of Educational Leadership

TO: College of Education Department Heads

FROM: Robert K. Roney, Professor

DATE: March 13, 1989

SUBJECT: Survey of Graduate Students' Concerns

Earlier this term you received a memo from Dean Wisniewski requesting your cooperation in asking the students in the classes in your department to complete a questionnaire regarding their assessment of a number of dimensions of their academic life in our college. Five Ph.D. students, four from Educational Leadership and one from Curriculum and Instruction, have been working on this project with me since the fall. We followed a preliminary survey done last summer with an ethnographic study in the fall and an open-ended questionnaire to a sample of our students earlier this term. The resulting questionnaire was then field tested on a group of graduate students at UTC this past week to verify clarity and readability, and minor adjustments were made. Enclosed is a copy of the final instrument. While there may be other questions you (or I) would like to include, these are the ones that emerged through our instrument-building process.

Data from this survey will be used in several ways. You will receive a confidential report wherein your own students' responses will be summarized and compared to the responses of the rest of the students in the College. No one but you will be told your department's identity in the report. You, then, can decide how best to use the results. The dean's office will be given a copy of the overall report, but the identity of the departments will be kept confidential. Data will be reported as percents (rather than as raw data) to protect for detection because of size of departments, and departments will be listed in random order in the report with a number or other coded designation. Data from the study should be useful as a part of our upcoming NCATE review. Finally, both methods and results may be the basis for publications and conference presentations during the next year. Again, anonymity of departments will be assured.

I felt it important to detail our approach and planned use of these data to assure you that no attempt is being made to cause any problem for any department in the College. Your cooperation in the study will be greatly appreciated, and hopefully we will gain some insights which will help all of us improve our graduate programs.

238 Claxton Addition Building/Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3400 (615) 974-2216 FAX (615) 974-6146